

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. In the Office Action, claims 1-13 were rejected. Claim 4 was objected to, but indicated as reciting allowable subject matter. By this Response Applicant has amended claims 1, 4 and 10, and added new claims 23-27 to include allowable subject matter. Upon entry of the amendments and new claims, claims 1-13 and 23-27 will remain pending in the present patent application.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner correctly pointed out that the term “the flexible material” has insufficient antecedent basis. *See* Office Action, pages 2, 3. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 10 so that sufficient antecedent basis is given for the above referenced term.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 4,750,258 hereinafter “Anderson”).

### ***Legal Precedent***

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires a showing that each limitation of a claim is found in a single reference, practice or device. *In re Donohue*, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

### ***Omitted Features from Independent Claim 1***

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is improper because the prior art reference that is used to reject the claim does not show

each and every element recited by the claim. For example, independent claim 1 recites “*a lead separating assembly, the leads extending beyond the stator from windings installed in stator slots.*” (Emphasis added). Accordingly, the subject matter recited by the claim addresses separating leads formed from stator windings *already* inserted into stator slots.

In contrast, Anderson fails to disclose *a lead separating assembly*, whereby the *leads* extend beyond the stator from windings installed in stator slots, as recited by claim 1. Instead, Anderson discloses an apparatus configured to *insert windings*, into slots of a stator. See Anderson, Abstract. In fact, a device like that of Anderson could be used to *insert* the windings before the lead separating assembly of the invention would be used to separate the leads of the windings. Anderson simply does not address how to separate the winding leads once the windings are installed in the stator slots.

Accordingly, Applicant stresses that the device taught by Anderson is fundamentally different from the one claimed. As further disclosed by Fig. 13 of Anderson and, as relied upon by the Examiner, a stripper is configured to “axially *insert* the coils of the coil groups into their respective slots.” Anderson, col. 6, lines 1, 2. Applicant submits that stator leads themselves are not inserted into stator slots as these are comprised of bundles of wire leading from the windings already put in place in the stator slots. Accordingly, the technique recited by the Applicant is concerned with separating leads, requiring an assembly conceptually different from an assembly which disposes the windings in the slots of the stator. Hence, Anderson cannot anticipate the claimed “*lead separating assembly, the leads extending beyond the stator from windings installed in stator slots*”, as recited by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of independent claim 1 is improper, as well as the rejection of dependent claims 3 and 8-10. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow claims 1, 3 and 8-10.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 5-7 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson. (U.S. Patent No. 4,750,258 hereinafter "Anderson"). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 5-7 and 11-13 are allowable based on their dependencies on independent claim 1, which Applicant believes is allowable in view of the remarks set forth above. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has clearly not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 2, 5-7 and 11-13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 2, 5-7 and 11-13.

**Allowable Subject Matter and New Claims**

Applicant has incorporated allowable subject matter into new added independent claim 23 and further added claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, the new claims recite subject matter relating to an assembly for separating stator leads. Applicant believes the claims are clearly distinct from the cited reference and are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to enter and consider new claims 23-27.

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims should be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/13/2006

29  
Patrick S. Yoder  
Reg. No. 37,479  
FLETCHER YODER  
P.O. Box 692289  
Houston, TX 77269-2289  
(281) 970-4545

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS**  
ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY, LLC  
Patent Department/704P Floor 8 T-29  
1201 South Second Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204  
Attention: Mr. Alexander Gerasimow  
Phone: (414) 382-2000